

*Canadian Arsenals Limited*

not know why they are saying those things at a time when the Government is selling the corporation. If the Government is prepared to admit that it is such a good corporation, then it should admit as well that it is partially its 800 workers who have made Canadian Arsenals a profitable, effective and proud Canadian entity which has triggered interest within the private sector. If the Government is prepared to admit that is so because of the diligence and responsibility of those 800 workers, it should feel at least a little obligated to give them what is rightfully theirs. When we are discussing the future of this corporation we should discuss the future of those 800 employees. They have invested their lives. They have their pension contributions locked up. But what the Government is prepared to say is: "Forget about that for a moment. We will bring forward a motion in future to deal with it. Right now just trust us". That is not good enough. It is not good business, good management, nor is it fair. It is not fair to the families of those workers who have a future with that particular company, whether it is under Government control or under the control of the private sector. They will continue to labour for that company and, therefore, it is incumbent upon the Government to allow them the opportunities which should be theirs. The Government should allow them to continue to place with the Government of Canada their pension contributions if they so desire. The choice should be theirs.

The union disagrees with the Government's policy, the workers disagree, the media disagrees, the two Opposition Parties disagree, and most fair-minded Canadians disagree. Their question and ours is, how can the Government proceed on this basis? We thought the Government learned a lesson a few short months ago when it was prepared to deindex senior citizens' pensions because it thought that they were unorganized, poorly financed and would not protest. But the Government was rightfully shocked to see the mobilization of senior citizens. The Government is thinking in the same narrow way with the same kind of "don't worry, we know what it is all about" attitude with respect to this pension issue facing the 800 employees of Canadian Arsenals. That is why we are asking for time. We are asking the Government to go back and look at itself in the mirror and ask itself if it is approaching the issue on behalf of Canadians as it ought to. As the Prime Minister said so often, this is supposed to be a Government for the people, by the people. We do not see that here and we have not seen it thus far on any other issue. The other question is on the Government's whole philosophy—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired.

The Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker).

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. George Baker (Gander-Twillingate):** Mr. Speaker, one would think that with a reception like that, those Hon. Members would agree unanimously to let me go on for the rest of the evening.

**Some Hon. Members:** Sure.

**Mr. Baker:** Please don't.

There are perhaps two reasons why the New Democratic Party moved this particular motion; first, it cannot comprehend the legislation, and I do not believe anyone in Canada could comprehend the position of the Government in relation to Crown corporations. It is a very confusing position. On the one hand, the Government wants to get rid of Crown corporations which are profitable and, on the other hand, we see the creation of Crown corporations to save money. For example, I refer to the creation just this year of the Crown corporation CN Marine. It is very difficult to really understand the policy of the Government. Only today, I understand, CN sold CN Route to a private firm, so I presume this House will be considering very shortly the fate of those employees and their pensions.

The Opposition is also concerned about the attitude of the Treasury Board towards employees. You might find this somewhat incredible, Mr. Speaker, but in the present negotiations going on with Treasury Board, for example, employees in the general labour and trades groups in Edmonton—with which city the Speaker is familiar—will, in certain categories, be making less than workers who work outside of Edmonton. The Government says that this only covers 18,000 or 19,000 employees. It is a bit confusing to have salary ranges differ according to whether one works in Ottawa or Toronto, but it is even more confusing when the unions are told the Government will pay different wages in Edmonton from those paid in areas outside of Edmonton.

With respect to crewmen on ships, there is a line called the 102nd parallel which goes up through Saskatchewan. If one is sailing a ship to the east of that line, one will make \$200 a month less than if one were sailing a ship to the west of that line. Hon. Members opposite might be interested to check with the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) to find out what happens when a ship actually crosses the line. Is it any wonder that the New Democratic and the Liberal Parties are asking to have another look at this Bill? We want to examine Government policy. The Government obviously does not know what it is doing with Crown corporations. For sure, it does not know what the attitude of Treasury Board is towards its employees. There are about 3,000 or 4,000 employees in the negotiating group of ships crews—but I see my time has expired.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. It being 5 o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 5 p.m.